

JAN 23 2007

Attorney Docket No.: 1500-11270

REMARKS

The Applicant has reviewed the Office Action mailed November 21, 2006. Claims 1-10 were rejected. Claims 11-20 were withdrawn from consideration by the Examiner. No claims have been amended or canceled in this response.

SPECIFICATION

The Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's objection to the title as filed. The Applicant asserts that the originally filed title is descriptive of the claims.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC § 102

Claims 1, 7, and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Sacks (US Patent No. 6,377,413). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. For a reference to anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim. Claims 1, 7, and 10 contain elements not taught by Sacks.

For example, Sacks does not teach or suggest "forming at least one alignment feature between an inner diameter and an outer diameter of each of a plurality of discs" as in Claim 1. In addition, Sacks fails to teach or suggest "utilizing the at least one alignment feature of a first disc of the plurality of discs and the at least one alignment feature of a second disc of the plurality of discs to substantially vertically align servo patterns on the first disc with servo patterns on the second disc" as in Claim 1.

The Examiner cites reference number 109 of FIG. 1 of Sacks as "forming at least one alignment feature". However, Sacks describes "a plurality of individual discs which are mounted for co-rotation about central axis 109." Sacks, Col. 3, Lines 39-41. As shown in Sacks' FIG. 1, the central axis 109 is located through a center hole of the discs. The Examiner has chosen to ignore the claim language of Claim 1 that an alignment feature is "between an inner diameter and an outer diameter" (Sacks' FIG. 1 reference numbers 124 and 126, respectively).

Sacks' clearly does not show such an alignment feature between an inner diameter and an outer diameter.

Furthermore, Sacks does not describe, teach, or even suggest aligning servo patterns of a disc pack. Instead, Sacks describes methods to select a disc for use with a specific head based on a characteristic of the disc. See Sacks, FIG.s 17 and 18.

Claims 7 and 10 are allowable as dependent claims that depend from Claim 1.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of all § 102 rejections.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC § 103

CLAIM 2

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of Claim 2 under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sacks in view of Hoogerwerf (US Patent No. 5,523,539). For at least the aforementioned reasons, Sacks fails to disclose each of the elements of Claim 1. The Examiner cites no other references that teach or suggest each of the elements of Claim 1. Furthermore, the combination of Sacks and Hoogerwerf cited by the Examiner also fails to teach each of the elements of Claim 1.

Specifically, Hoogerwerf fails to disclose discs, a disc pack, any method related to a disc pack, or a "laser mark on each of the plurality of discs", as in Claim 2.

Thus, Claim 2 is allowable as a dependent claim depending from Claim 1.

CLAIMS 3 and 5

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of Claims 3 and 5 under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sacks in view of Damer (US Patent No. 6,365,061). For at least the aforementioned reasons, Sacks fails to disclose each of the elements of Claim 1. The Examiner cites no other references that teach or suggest each of the elements of Claim 1. Furthermore, the combination of Sacks and Damer cited by the Examiner also fails to teach each of the elements of Claim 1.

Thus, Claims 3 and 5 are allowable as dependent claims depending from Claim 1.

CLAIMS 4 and 6

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of Claims 4 and 6 under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sacks in view of Chuang (US Patent No. 6,105,240). For at least the aforementioned reasons, Sacks fails to disclose each of the elements of Claim 1. The Examiner cites no other references that teach or suggest each of the elements of Claim 1. Furthermore, the combination of Sacks and Chuang cited by the Examiner also fails to teach each of the elements of Claim 1.

Specifically, Chuang fails to disclose discs, a disc pack, any method related to a disc pack, or a "an imbalance reduction feature" on a disc, as in Claim 4 and 6. Chuang describes a balancing machine, not an imbalance reduction feature on a disc.

Thus, Claims 4 and 6 are allowable as dependent claims depending from Claim 1.

CLAIMS 8 and 9

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of Claims 8 and 9 under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sacks in view of Stefansky (US Patent No. 5,404,636). For at least the aforementioned reasons, Sacks fails to disclose each of the elements of Claim 1. The Examiner cites no other references that teach or suggest each of the elements of Claim 1. Furthermore, the combination of Sacks and Stefansky cited by the Examiner also fails to teach each of the elements of Claim 1.

Thus, Claims 8 and 9 are allowable as dependent claims depending from Claim 1.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of all § 103 rejections.

JAN. 23. 2007 3:34PM

TOLER SCHAFFER

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JAN 23 2007

NO. 258 P. 10

Attorney Docket No.: 1500-11270


CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is requested to issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims. If, for any reason, the Office is unable to allow the Application on the next Office Action, and believes a telephone interview would be helpful, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney or agent.

Applicant does not believe that any additional fees are due, but if the Commissioner believes additional fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-2469.

Respectfully submitted

1-23-2007
Date


Kirk A. Cesari; Reg. No. 47,479
Attorney for Applicant
TOLER SCHAFFER, L.L.P.
5000 Plaza On The Lake, Suite 265
Austin, Texas 78746
(512) 327-5515 (phone)
(512) 327-5575 (fax)